

Farm Labor

"EQUAL RIGHTS FOR

AGRICULTURAL WORKERS"



FARM LABOR -- advocating "Equal Rights for Agricultural Workers"

Published by Citizens for Farm Labor,
Box 1173, Berkeley 1, California.

25¢ per copy; \$3.00 for 12 issues

Editors: Henry Anderson
Wendy Goepel

Volume II, No. 6; March 1965

CONTENTS

Editorial

Borders, Economies, and Societies: Opened and Closed. . . . 1

Articles

Farm Placement Go Home by Joseph Gunterman 7
Speaking of Sugarbeets reprinted from EL MALCRIADO10
Unemployment Insurance and the Dead Hand by Henry Anderson .13
The Problem of Border Crossers--commuters by Henry Munoz . .17
Picking Carrots Near Indio by Howard Richards.22

Special Features

Facts About Sugarbeets.11
California Industrial Welfare Commission: public hearings . .21
Rural Unemployment Rates, California, January 1965.23
Index to Volume II.26

Departments

Current and Currents. 2
Letters to the Editors.24
Report to the Subscriber.25

Special Insert: EQUAL RIGHTS FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS,
the role of FARM LABOR readers, plus
Members of the 1965 California Legislature

About the Cover: Andy Zermano grew up in the southern San Joaquin Valley. He did farm work for awhile and then moved to Los Angeles to study art. For several years, he has been drawing picture sequences for a movie which will depict the life of a farm worker family as he has experienced it. Andy hopes the entire cost of his movie will be borne by farm workers and their friends; our cover picture this month is taken from one scene in this film. Any readers interested in this venture may write to Andy at 2305 Kent Street, Los Angeles.

Entire Contents, labor donated.
Copyright, 1965, by Citizens for Farm Labor.

"In our haste, we tend to equate material poverty with spiritual and cultural poverty.... As we undertake to rid the Southwest of poverty, let us not be too grim about it. We will be working in a land of great beauty--amongst people of great beauty. We must be sure that our efforts in no way erode the great gifts of diversity we enjoy here--a diversity of language, art, dance, ceremony, religion. The Anglo must learn to take his appropriate place in the history of this region--the last to arrive--in every sense, the newcomer. We owe to ourselves an obligation not to overcome difference, but to preserve and honor diversity, for Anglo affluence itself badly needs the cultural enrichment of the ancient peoples of the Southwest.

--Paul O'Rourke, M.D.,
Director, Farm Workers Health Service
Governor's Assistant, Anti-Poverty Planning
State of California

Editorial
BORDERS, ECONOMIES AND SOCIETIES: OPEN AND CLOSED

Thirty five years ago, testifying on immigration policy, Harry Chandler, publisher of the Los Angeles Times and one of the largest landholders in California, said:

"...the peon who comes (to the U.S.) is an innocent, friendly, kindly, individual. He has to be industrious, for he has to work in order to live. ...They are not enterprising, of course, like other races, but they are more desirable from our standpoint than any other class of labor that comes, and they create fewer problems. ...when the time of need is over, the border is not far away. ...Mexican labor is less quarrelsome and troublemaking than any other class of labor that comes to America."

(Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization,
United States House of Representatives, January 24, 1930, pp. 60, 64)

The names change, but the sentiments remain the same. So long as Mexico remains an impoverished country, her hungry citizens, willing to work for wages and under conditions unacceptable to most Americans, will constitute an irresistible temptation to growers near the border. And growers farther from the border, seeing their colleagues enjoy the seeming windfall of cheap labor, will find it an irresistible temptation too. Like each of us in his own way, they will need help in resisting temptation.

One form of help would be to close the border. Nothing would be required beyond the conscientious enforcement of laws already on the books. Any time the Department of Labor decides to take seriously its responsibilities to prevent "adverse effect" upon domestic workers, it can call a halt to all foreign contract labor importation. And any time the Immigration and Naturalization Service decides to take seriously that portion of the law concerning immigrants "admitted for permanent residence", it can call a halt to the travesty of border-crossing system. (See Henry Munoz's article in this issue)

But there is another approach: no doubt slower, but more sure. So long as there is an enormous disparity between the levels of living of Mexico and the United States, the border situation will be inherently unstable and volatile. Even assuming a tightly sealed border could be policed, there would be large numbers of people, on both sides, trying to upset and unseal it: agricultural employers, pining for cheap labor, and Mexican workers, pining for jobs at any wage. The spectacle would not be a happy one.

Any permanent solution to the problems of these two groups of people (not to mention American farm workers) requires equilibrium: either the level of living in the United States will be dragged down to roughly that of Mexico, or that of Mexico will be elevated to roughly that of the United States. We assume the latter alternative is preferable to both countries. When it is achieved, there will be a reasonable amount of international movement, as there is now between the United States and her other immediate neighbor, Canada. But there will not be the frenzied, compulsive type of movement which now characterizes the U.S.-Mexico border, with workers driven by hunger and growers driven by a vision of servile labor.

The ideal is open borders--not only between the United States and Mexico, but everywhere. But that ideal requires, at the same time, equally open economies and societies. Amid the day to day discussions of the farm labor situation, let us not lose sight of those truths.

H.P.A. W.P.G.

CURRENT AND CURRENTS

I. Scholarship, Giannini Style, Part II
(See FARM LABOR, Vol. II, No. 5, pp. 7-10)

"About 100 San Joaquin County orchardists attended the Orchard Institute held last week in the White Hall (Manteca). ... Dr. Eric Thor, University of California Economist, reviewed the past history of imported farm labor and gave prospects for sufficient help in the coming year.

"While confusion reigns today, ...he advised orchardists to form an organization and then work through the organization. He said there would no doubt be pressure groups, and lots of red herrings exposed, and a real drive made to raise wages by these groups as well as 'do gooders and non-agricultural groups.' He cautioned ranchers not to be pressured by the Secretary of Labor's regulations as this pertains only to growers who contract for foreign labor.... Orchardists using local or other labor need not obey the rate." Manteca Bulletin, 1/25/65.

"Eric Thor, University of California economist, has declared there is a critical period of only two to three weeks' time remaining during which California agriculture can decide if the state will have major vegetable crops this next season....

"He said it appears the United States Department of Labor is putting the state's vegetable growers on the block in a test of whether the urban unemployed will accept farm jobs. ...

"The economist said the federal labor department...shows no sign of yielding. He called the federal labor secretary's attitude dictatorial. What California needs, Thor declared, is a clear commitment from federal authorities that foreign labor will be brought in.... He reported California bankers, who finance most of the state's vegetable crops with produce loans, are concerned that this year's crops might be sacrificed...."

Sacramento Bee, 1/30/65.

"A note of alarm, almost of desperation, was sounded last weekend at an annual conference of the farm machinery industry (by) Eric Thor, University of California extension specialist...."

Woodland Record, 2/4/65.

"Dr. Eric Thor, University of California agricultural economist, reported (to the National Cannery Association) California farmers will need temporary farm workers from outside the state nearly every month of the year to harvest the 1965 crops."

Sacramento Bee, 2/12/65.

II. Vox Populi

"I am 17 years old. Last year I put in many hours in the fields. ...How the farmers expect to keep youth on a job is beyond me. All the farmer can say now is that he needs the bracero back. This is a self-inflicted problem done purposely. I can't ever remember working a day when no one was fired. ...One of my friends was fired because his trick knee went out and he fell to his knees in the field. I could write a hundred other examples where I have personally seen the farmer discourage local laborers. The farmers of California are going to have to make a few basic guarantees to the laborers in order to get the workers to work. Guarantees such as minimum wage--I have personally seen the present dollar an hour minimum wage law broken--and maximum and minimum hours for a day's work...." Chuck Briggs, Sacramento.

Letter to the Editor
Sacramento Bee, 1/15/65

"I read the letter by Chuck Briggs concerning the teenage worker in the fields and agree wholeheartedly with him. Jobs being very difficult to find, my two boys, ages 16 and 17, turned to farm labor. What an experience they had! They would leave the house at 4 am and usually return between 3 and 5 pm--hot, dirty, worn out and almost too tired to eat and with blisters on their hands. Both boys have...done hard work which they don't mind, but they do like fair treatment. There were days they and other kids, too, had a long tiresome wait in line to find out if they would be put to work, being herded around like cattle. Some days were spent waiting in line only to be told to come back tomorrow. Also, one day they were used for two hours, given their checks, already made in advance and kept out there in the fields, under the hot sun with nothing to do but wait for the trucks to bring them back late in the afternoon.

"The boys were real excited about finding a job, but were discouraged all too soon by the unfair treatment and decided to chalk it up to experience and look elsewhere for work." Mrs. A.K.

Letter to the Editor,
Sacramento Bee, 1/22/65.

"We heard the braceros were needed for 'stoop labor'. Now the labor shortage seems to be for men to work on the top of 50 foot ladders and pollinate date palms, Some stoop labor.

"More and more they succeed in making these farm jobs look like skilled labor. Can't they find men from among America's steeplejacks, high riggers, and structural steel workers to take care of the dates?" Frank Kennedy, Atherton,
Letter to the Editor, San Francisco News-Call, 1/18/65

"Hell, no, they didn't pay \$1.25 an hour in the Coachella Valley, and mister they don't want date pickers very bad either. We tried, my wife and kids and I, but all they'd let us do is top carrots...for 60 to 70 cents an hour.' This was Jack B., a 37 year old unemployed truck driver. He was attracted to California by the noise raised in the batter over termination of the bracero contract worker program.

"Compare what he says with the angry statements of a federal official. 'Too many Southern California farmers just plain don't want to hire American workers. The way they treat them is intolerable. Growers in the Coachella and Imperial Valleys have to reorient their thinking on labor relations.'"

Fresno Bee, 1/24/65

"James Fague, 44, spat in the small fire he and six other migrant farm workers had built by the railroad tracks. 'The growers don't want us,' he complained bitterly. 'All they want is Mexicans. Everybody says we won't do the work so the government will get back the braceros.'..."

"In a Santa Paula farm labor camp, just northeast of (Oxnard), 12 American farm hands sat idly in their barracks four days after they had been recruited in Los Angeles for citrus picking. 'It took us two days in Los Angeles to get interviewed and hired,' said Marvin Seeley, 39, a migrant Kansas worker who had heard work was plentiful in California. 'They brought us to this camp and we've been sitting here for two days. The barracks are clean and the food is good. But we're not working and the room and board is being charged against wages we're not sure we'll ever get.'..."

"Said picker James Fague: 'The problem will never be solved until we all realize that the bracero may not complain about conditions--but I will.'"

Los Angeles Times, 2/14/65

III. Politics, Politics (See also, pp. 13916)

"A proposal to put farm workers on unemployment insurance, which has been killed by the legislature numerous times, is before the assembly again today. Heretofore the measure has been introduced by a legislator from a metropolitan area (who) has no farmers in his district. It usually gets through the urban dominated assembly but is killed in the rural senate. This time, Fresno Assemblyman George N. Zenovich, Chairman of the Finance and Insurance Committee, put in the bill, A.B. 624."... Modesto Bee, 1/28/65.

"There are sound economic reasons behind the actions of the Congress and the various state legislatures when the various bodies exempted farmers from paying unemployment insurance...as they began to enact such social legislation three decades ago. The seasonal and transient nature of farm labor, then as now, makes the administration of jobless insurance for farm workers well nigh impossible and certainly exorbitant in costs. ...

"Yet there are persistent efforts in proposed new laws...to bring the farms of California into the fold of insured employment. Such legislation is part of Gov. Edmund G. Brown's legislative program this year...."

Yuba City Independent-Herald, 1/20.

"Speaker Jesse M. Unruh today virtually doomed the chances of most liberal bills scheduled to come before the legislature this year. By placing conservatives in control of key committees, Unruh made it extremely difficult for pro-labor measures and additional social welfare benefits to be enacted during 1965....

"Farm labor measures go before the agriculture committee, which has been pared down from 18 to 15 members. The margin is 8-7 (D), with three of the Democrats likely to oppose major liberal measures. ...Republicans were elated with the choices."

Oakland Tribune, 2/2/65.

"The Associated Farmers of California oppose extending state unemployment insurance to agriculture. The group took the stand in a resolution adopted at a meeting in the Hotel Senator yesterday.

"Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz's establishment of minimum wages for farm workers was called 'an arbitrary administrative decree--foreign to our economy.' The farm group also complained that state officials are making an 'increasingly liberal interpretation of agricultural compensation insurance.'...

"Governor Edmund G. Brown was praised for ordering the police to step in and arrest the University of California sitins in Berkeley. The Associated Farmers' resolution commended the governor 'for his strong support of the Berkeley authorities in prosecuting the demonstrators to the full extent of the law!'"

Sacramento Bee, 2/9/65.

"Money to hire 250 additional farm labor recruiters and to develop new harvest machinery was asked in Governor Edmund G. Brown's budget yesterday. Both budget items, he noted, are needed immediately in view of California's farm labor crisis.

"Actually the Federal Government, and not California taxpayers, will be asked to pay the additional salaries in the State Farm Labor Offices; the Federal Government pays all expenses of the State Department of Employment. (The Federal State public employment system is financed by a portion of unemployment insurance premiums--to which agricultural employers do not contribute, ED.)

"The research money would be given to the University of California, whose agricultural automation studies already have produced a tomato harvester and new tomato plants suitable for automated harvesting. ...The total agricultural budget (would be) up \$277,810 to \$21.6 million for 1965-66...."

San Francisco Examiner, 1/26/65.

IV. The Clouded Crystal Ball.

"...an air of pessimism and uncertainty seems to have gripped our farmers.. paramount in their minds is the question of reapportionment.... Supreme Court decisions...threaten to nullify the checks and balances which have over the years worked so well in the California legislature. Most certainly, if both the Senate and the Assembly are apportioned on a population basis, the vast rural segments of our State will lose representation and influence. The eventual effect on all agricultural legislation...could be severe." Patterson Irrigator, 1/14/65.

"WANTED: Men and women to work on a farm. Must be physically strong and willing to tackle any task at hand. Mechanical ability helpful. Long hours; fair pay. Suitable living quarters available." This is an imaginary ad--but the kind which may soon appear throughout the United States. Such ads are an anticipated part of Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz's recruitment plan to secure American farm workers for seasonal agricultural jobs."

U.S. Dept. Labor press release, 1/18/65.

"Farm pay rates in the Sacramento Valley will average between \$1.87 and \$1.90 an hour by the time the harvest season ends next fall...."

W.J. Monahan, in Yuba City Independent-Herald, 1/20/65.

"An optimistic view of the farm labor situation is taken in the current issue of 'Insider's Newsletter', a Cowles Magazine publication. Says Insider's: The Labor Department's posture against authorizing use of Mexican workers...will eventually break-down.... Secretary Wirtz is insisting that the growers try harder to hire U.S. citizens. ... But he knows, and knows the growers know he knows, that this is the slack harvest season. ...he can work out an agreement (with Mexico) in a few days if need be." Watsonville Register-Pajaronian, 1/27/65.

"California agricultural leaders who testified before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in Washington last week believe some good was accomplished in their efforts to prevent a farm labor shortage. ...E.J. Raffetto, a Salinas grower-shipper and president of the California-Arizona Farm Labor Association had this to say: '...we feel that (Secretary Wirtz) left the door open just a crack for the use of Public Law 414 when he told the committee that 'we will not allow crops to rot.'"

Merced Sun-Star, 1/30/65.

"The California farm labor situation as it exists after the end of the bracero program will soon undergo a congressional investigation. The hearing, which probably will be held (in Los Angeles) within a month, will be headed by Rep. James Roosevelt (D-Calif.), a member of the House Education and Labor Committee."

Los Angeles Times, 2/5/65.

"Coachella Valley date growers, faced with an \$8 million crop loss because of a labor shortage, have bluntly warned U.S. Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz to get off the dime or face court action." S.F. Commercial News, 2/8/65.

"Reactivation of the controversial bracero program that was terminated on Dec. 31 will be discussed by U.S. and Mexican legislators at an interparliamentary conference Sunday in La Paz, Baja, California. Rep. Edward J. Derwinski, R-Ill., a member of the U.S. delegation, predicted...the Mexican government will initiate negotiations to restore the program. Californians who will attend the conference include Sen. Thomas Kuchel, and Congressmen Harold Johnson, Ronald Cameron, and Alphonzo Bell."

Palo Alto Times, 2/13/65.

"Phillipine Ambassador Oscar Ledesma toured the San Joaquin Valley Saturday to see if Filipinos can replace Mexican braceros as farm labor. 'We have thousands of young men who would like very much to come to this country to work,' he said. 'Many of them are college graduates in agriculture.'

"Ledesma said the Imperial Valley Farmers' Association has placed an order for 2000 Phillipine nationals." Los Angeles Times, 2/14/65.

V. Point of View.

"Tri-Valley Growers of Stockton, one of the State's leading canning organizations said yesterday it plans to close down part of its tomato canning operations because of 'the chaotic harvest labor situation' that has resulted from abandonment of the bracero program. Executive vice-president Philip N. Mark said the \$50 million-a-year cooperative is also studying the possibility of transferring some of its operations to Mexico....

"Thomas L. Pitts, secretary-treasurer of the State Labor Federation, called the canners' announcement 'pure poppycock--propaganda of the most deceitful variety. The truth, he asserted, 'is that the plant in question 'is and has been principally engaged in canning peaches and pears. It has handled tomatoes only as a very minor sideline.'" San Francisco Chronicle, 2/20/65.

"What kind of people testified against agriculture in the recent hearing conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor...? (Ed. Note: see FARM LABOR, Vol. II, No. 5, pp. 22-28). We remember the cold gray eyes of Paul Jacobs, staff specialist at UC on industrial relations. Here are some of the words used by Jacobs at the hearing: 'The agricultural workers of California are victims of blackmail politics'. He called for a congressional investigation of the situation which he called 'immoral' and 'probably illegal'. He suggested the Farm Placement Service be abolished. ...

"An organization that used a little more dignified language in the brief they submitted was the Emergency Committee to Aid Farm Workers.... They say: '...the bracero is exploited as all captive labor forces in history have been.'

"The West Oakland Farm Workers Association says: 'The hearing is a planned subterfuge. We have seen fake proceedings of this type used in Communist countries to gloss over tyranny.'....

"Well, that is just a sample of the 'high type' propaganda being handed out by the vicious enemies of agriculture. It's a pity some high-spirited person does not take this type into court and make him put up or shut up."

Jack Pickett, "Poison Pens of Farmers' Enemies" California Farmer, 1/16/65.

Postscript: comments from farm workers in the lemon harvest, Ventura County, all quotes: Ventura Star-Free Press, 2/4, 2/10, 2/12/65.

James Crandall: "I worked up a storm...I really worked...for an extra 50 cents a day...(I) grossed \$201 for 28 days worked in January."

"How come a man can't know what he is making before he works? I want to continue picking lemons but why do I have to wait until after I work to know what I made when they can set the price...."

anonymous: "I don't drink".

"There must be something wrong when so many quit. They won't keep steady help because they don't want steady help. They want to prove they can hire 5000 to keep only 200."

Mrs. Verna Peden: "We were born and bred here and we intend to make a living here. It's not that we won't work, it's these big shots who won't let us."

At the U.S. Department of Labor hearings in San Francisco last December 7th, Citizens for Farm Labor testified in favor of abolishing the California Farm Placement Service as a separate and unequal "service" to working men and women. This stand was taken prior to and is largely independent of the current Farm Placement scandal about falsified records in some offices. The article below is written by a member of CFL's Advisory Board who shares the Executive Committee's official position. Joe Gunterman is editor of the Cascade Labor weekly and is a legislative advocate in Sacramento for the Friends Committee on Legislation.

FARM PLACEMENT GO HOME!

by Joe Gunterman

It's time to do away with the Farm Placement Service in the California Department of Employment. It is a symbol of the second class status in which we hold farm workers and it is a means of keeping them in that status.

We do not have a Retail Clerks' Placement Service, nor a Beauticians' Placement Service, nor a Sawmill Workers' Placement Service. We look upon retail clerks, beauticians and sawmill workers, for all of the differences in skills and employment conditions which their jobs may entail, as first class citizens. In the larger cities, we may set up separate offices or staffs for certain occupation groups, for the sake of convenience, but we do not segregate those groups purposely.

We do segregate farm workers. We provide a separate Farm Placement Service for them and house it in an office on the wrong side of the tracks, a long way from the main, uptown office where other workers go.

There is method in this madness of segregation, of course. It keeps a group of people outside of the rest of the community. Since the members of the segregated group--whether farm workers, members of a minority race, the poor, or all three--do not belong to the community, the community will permit their exploitation. The economy of the community then is built upon that exploitation.

There is no practical reason for the Department of Employment to maintain segregated farm labor offices. Janitors and bus drivers, like farm workers, put in unusual hours. Jobs for carpenters, like jobs for farm workers, are likely to be for short terms and to be scattered throughout the area. Other laborers, like farm workers, may be needed in large numbers.

Many workers shift back and forth between farm employment and other jobs, such as construction, cannery work, restaurant jobs, warehousing and other activities where there may be openings for the unskilled and semi-skilled. There is no reason why the jobless peach picker should not have a chance at a construction job, if he has the skill for it, nor why the jobless maintenance man, who once did farm work, should not have a chance to return to it when there

are no openings for maintenance men.

The problems raised by the difference in pay scales and in eligibility for unemployment insurance come into the picture when one considers this shifting back and forth in jobs. However, those problems are not germane to the discussion of abolishing the Farm Placement Service except, as evidences of our habitual discrimination against farm workers, they emphasize how wrong it is to discriminate further by shunting farm workers into separate, second class offices.

Today there is a new emphasis on retraining workers, because of automation and technological changes and because of the new awareness of so-called "pockets of poverty" in our affluent society. (Actually they are not so much "pockets" as full-length rips in the garment.) As new counselling, testing, training and placement programs are brought into the Department of Employment, are they going to be available to farm workers? If they are, then obviously the easiest way to make them available is to have the farm workers in the same offices, getting the same information and following the same procedures as other workers.

There may be legitimate reasons for having an employment office "on the wrong side of the tracks." But should it be just a farm employment office? We should do away with the "tracks" as a symbol of acceptance or rejection. There should be full-scale employment offices, with all services, on either or both sides of the tracks, as the situation may demand. And to be of real help to farm workers, in all of its services, the Department should have many more offices in smaller, rural communities now served from larger towns at some distance.

Who knows--if the Department of Employment offices became more easily accessible, and the staffs more in sympathy with farm labor's needs, farm workers might begin using those offices! It is understandable that, under conditions that have existed to date, only a small percentage of farm workers have ever been inside a Department of Employment office.

This matter of "staffs more in sympathy with farm labor's needs" brings in another aspect of the proposal to abolish the separate Farm Placement Service.

During the long years of Ed Hayes' regime as chief of Farm Placement, that service was subservient to the growers. It discriminated against domestic farm workers and protected growers in their evasions of Public Law 78. Its function was to administer the bracero program, not to help domestic farm workers.

Increasingly since 1959, the directors of the Department of Employment have sought to provide a fairer set-up for farm labor. Citizens sympathetic to agricultural workers, and agricultural workers themselves, have on occasion disagreed with some of the Department's farm labor decisions, but generally the intent to be fair has motivated Employment Directors John Carr, Irving Perluss, and Albert Tieburg.

Still the negative attitudes toward farm labor, the efforts to help the grower at the cost of farm workers, have continued in many local Farm Placement offices. Farm workers applying for jobs have been stalled or harrassed in order to protect certifications for braceros. At least one Farm Placement manager has argued the need for a continued farm labor import program before his service club. Other incidents of that type have occurred.

Whereas the top direction over Farm Placement may have changed, the lower echelons frequently have not. Hayes-indoctrinated staff members in local Farm Placement offices, protected by civil service, have continued the attitudes and habits which cause farm workers to distrust the entire Farm Placement Service and refuse to seek obs there.

Moving the Farm Placement staffs into the general employment offices, and the resulting re-assignment of duties, would dilute the old guard's impact upon the task of agricultural referrals. As part of a larger staff, the personnel of the old Farm Placement Service would be subjected to new, hopefully liberalizing influences. Those who persisted in anti-worker attitudes could be given assignments with the least opportunity for carrying those attitudes into action.

Presumably grower groups would protest against such a shift, just as they protest against any other move to treat farm workers as first class citizens. But who would listen to them? Do they pay for the costs of the Farm Placement Service? They don't. The costs of that service are paid by those employers who pay into the unemployment insurance fund, and growers as a group do not pay into the fund. City employers, who do pay into it, presumably would have no objection to a shift that might save money and would raise the standards of Department of Employment service in the agricultural area to that which exists for business and industry.

The proposal to abolish the Farm Placement Service should present no traumatic problems to the Department of Employment. Already, in many communities, the farm placement's work is carried on in the same office and largely by the same staff as other work. Extending a complete--and, we hope, improved--job service to rural communities now served only by a Farm Placement trailer in the harvest season would, of course, require an increased budget.

But what is needed first of all is a recognition that the Farm Placement Service is a symbol of second class status for farm workers and a means of keeping them in that status. It should be abolished.

* * * * *

QUOTES OF THE MONTH

from the press: "The legendary integrity of the American Indian is as true in local citrus orchards as on the plains of yore. Sixty-five Navajos imported from their Cuba, New Mexico, reservation are conscientiously gathering picking speed and are quickly becoming one of the key hopes of labor-hungry county citrus growers. None of them had seen a lemon tree before coming last week to Ventura County where the \$30 million lemon crop is being harvested.

"It is exciting," Richard Lazero, a Laguna Indian...said...."

from the governor of California: (Just before Governor Brown conceded to grower demands and asked for the implementation of Public Law 414 braceros, he spent a day in the date groves, inspecting the groves. The governor climbed a date palm. The next day at his press conference, he was asked how that felt and he replied:

"When I was up on the tree, I felt insecure, more than usual."

from the Ventura Star-Free Press and the Los Angeles Times, respectively.

The following story is reprinted, with permission from a new Spanish language magazine for California farm workers. The magazine deals primarily with topical stories about the life and conditions of farm workers; the past issue featured a number of different articles relating to the problems of California's sugar beet industry. It included the article below. Spanish speaking readers of FARM LABOR may get a year's subscription to this new magazine by sending \$2.00 to Box 1173, Berkeley.

PLATICAS DE BETABEL

-Historieta-

Cuando esta lloviendo y no hay trabajo, tres amigos, El Sarco, Meliton y La Rula, pasan el tiempo bajo del portal de la tienda metiendo tijera y cortando garra.

"Porque debe hacer tanto frio y estar tan llovioso a este tiempo del ano?" dice La Rula.

El Sarco mete mano a la bolsa de la Rula y saca un cigarillo. --"Tu Rula pareses una vieja".

"Claro que si" dice Meliton, quien se divierte con un retrato que pinta en la tierra.

"No solamente los sueldos seran tan bajos como el ano pasado", dice La Rula con cara aceda. "No solamente habra harta yerba y los surcos mas tupidos. Pero para acabar de amolar las cosas, mi suegra que parece una cotorra y trage como un marrano ha venido a vivir con nosotros. No se conforma con esto, pero hasta se ha traído al borrachales de mi suegro con ella."

"Que lastima", mormura Meliton, todavia escribiendo en la tierra.

"Rula, es imposible tratar con tigo" dice El Sarco, encendiendo su cigarillo y viendolo con repugnancia.

"Como es lloron".

Continua La Rula: "Tu piensas que me quejo. Pero el ano pasado trabajando en el Betabel tuve mucho derecho a

SPEAKING OF SUGARBEETS

-A Playlet-

It's raining and there's no work. Three friends, Sarco, Meliton, and La Rula, are spending their day beneath the awning of the general store, chewing the fat, killing time.

"Why's it have to be so cold and rain so much this time of year", says La Rula.

Sarco sticks his hand in La Rula's pocket and pulls out a cigarette. "You talk like an old lady", he says.

"You sure do", says Meliton, who is amusing himself drawing pictures in the dirt.

"Not only will the wages be as low as last year," says La Rula with a pained expression. "Not only will there be more weeds and fuller rows, but my mother-in-law--who looks like a fat witch and drinks like a fish, is coming to live with us. But that's not enough for her: she's bringing my drunken old father-in-law along too."

"What a shame", mumbles Meliton, still scratching the ground.

"Rula, it's impossible to deal with you", says Sarco, lighting his cigarette and looking at it with distaste. "What a crybaby."

Rula continues: "You think I'm complaining now! But last year working in the sugar beets, I really had something to complain about. They gave me a hoe with a blade even smaller than yours!"

Meliton-yawns "Huh?"

quejarme. Me dieron un azadon con la oja mas chica que le tuyo!"

Meliton bostezea--"que dices?"

"Es muy cierto", repite La Rula. "Un azadon con la oja mucho mas chica que el tuyo. Y que la de mi amigo Meliton.

"Este tiene la enfermedad de la lengua", explica El Sarco.

A este instante se ve venir por la calle lodosa al molege del Betabel del ano pasado, muy Mickey Mouse con sus botas nuevas. Pasa frente a los tres trabajadores y entra a la tienda.

El Sarco dice--"Si hay motivo para quejarse. Esta Garrapata que entro a la tienda se clavo mucho dinero de mi sudor. Este hijo del Maiz junto con su patron el Coyote, nos tenian trabajando por 85 centavos por surco. Este jaorbado desgraciado nos trajo desaijando y escardando los dos trabajos en uno por menos de \$7.00 por acre. Debemos ganar lo minimo de \$1.15 por hora y esta Garrapata y su patron se clavaron la parte que nos corresponde. Meressen que los moje un perro!"

Meliton quien por fin ha terminado de pintar un retrato en la tierra, mira al Sarco con gran seriedad. --"No!" dice el. "Que no lo moje un perro, porque nos veremos obligados a trabajar con el este ano. El trabajo y el sueldo son bastante malos, bastaria con el olor!"

Ya la lluvia ha terminado. Sale el Garrapata de la tienda con tres azadones nuevecitos. "Listos muchachos", les dice, "Yamanos a trabajar".

"It's true", repeats La Rula. "A hoe with a blade much smaller than your blade. Smaller than Meliton's too."

"The fella's running off at the mouth", says Sarco.

At that moment, they see their sugarbeet foreman from last year coming up the muddy street, very Mickey Mouse in his new boots. He passes in front of the three workers and disappears into the store.

Sarco says "You're right. There is something to gripe about. That fink, along with his boss, Mr. Coyote, had us working for 85 cents a row. That vulture that just went in the store pockets a small fortune off of my sweat. The robber had us thinning and weeding, both jobs at the same time, for less than seven bucks an acre. We're supposed to be getting a dollar-fifteen an hour minimum and that vulture and his boss lifted our part for themselves. A dog ought to lift his leg on the both of them."

Meliton, who has finally tired of scratching in the dirt, looks at Sarco very solemnly. "No", he says. "I hope the dogs don't bother him, because we're going to have to work with those guys again this year. The work and wages are bad enough. An extra stink would be too much to take!"

Now the rain has stopped. The Vulture prances out of the general store with three shiny new hoes under his arm. "Ready boys?" he says. "Let's get to work."

---translated-and discretely paraphrased-by Kenneth Willing----

* * * * *

FACTS ABOUT SUGAR BEETS

--Under the Sugar Act of 1948, "fair and reasonable wages" must be paid to farm workers engaged in beet culture and harvest activities. An annual public hearing is held in California to determine what this wage will be. At present it is \$1.15 per hour.

--The vast majority of California farm workers are not paid the \$1.15 per hour which Federal Law prescribes they receive. The law is evaded either because workers do not know about their "paper rights", do not want to pursue them, or because growers

growers pay by the acre, rather than the hour, making computation of proper hourly wages very difficult.

--Sugar beet thinning and weeding comes at a time of year when there is little other work available in the southern San Joaquin Valley; this means that workers who have been informed of their rights are often reluctant to protest for fear of having no work at all.

--Sugar beet thinning and weeding in other parts of the state comes at times when domestic farm workers have other choices for work. There has been an "alleged labor shortage" of beet workers in these areas and braceros have been traditionally used for the work. Yet beet work is the only type work on farms in California where workers are guaranteed a minimum wage.

--Last year, a federal investigation of sugar beet thinning wages was conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which is responsible for making sure that workers receive their \$1.15 an hour. The investigation was made after repeated complaints from farm labor groups. After federal investigators spent seven weeks in the southern San Joaquin Valley, processing complaints by several hundred farm workers, the results of the investigation were filed in the Washington D.C. office but the workers never received a penny of the back wages promised to them.

--Under the Sugar Act of 1948, sugar beet growers who pay "fair and reasonable" wages to their field workers are entitled to large federal subsidies for crops. In 1964, federal government payments to California beet growers, as authorized by the Sugar Act, amounted to \$10,571,747. More money was paid to growers in California under the Sugar Act than under any other federal subsidy program; payments to beet growers amounted to more than 1/3rd of all government payments to California agriculture. (source: California Farmer, Feb. 20, 1965, p. 27) All California beet growers received their federal subsidies this year in spite of the fact that federal investigators found that workers were not receiving the \$1.15 due them and in spite of the fact that the Sugar Act states that growers shall not receive their payments if their workers do not receive the federal minimum wage.

--In Hawaii, sugar workers are paid \$2.47 per hour.

--The next time you go shopping, compare the price of C & H Sugar (grown in Hawaii where wages to workers are \$2.47 per hour) with the price of Spreckels Sugar (grown in California where workers are occasionally paid as high as \$1.15 per hour). Then you will understand why we bother to be concerned about beets!

ASSEMBLY AND SENATE COMMITTEES WHICH WILL HEAR FARM LABOR LEGISLATION.

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEES

Finance and Insurance Committee (will hear Unemployment bills): Zenovich (Chairman), Moretti (Vice Chairman), Ashcraft, Beilenson, Casey, Deukmejian, Fenton, Flournoy, Foran, Hinckley, Knox, Mills, Rumford, Russell, Soto, Stevens, Thelin, Veneman, Veysey, Waldie and Wilson.

Industrial Relations Committee (will hear Minimum Wage, Fair Labor Standards, and Collective Bargaining bills): Dymally (Chairman), Veysey (Vice Chairman), Badham, Burton, Cusanovich, Davis, Elliott, R. Johnson, and Powers.

Ways and Means Committee (hears all bills which would require an appropriation--such as for state enforcement of the proposed new law):* Crown (Chairman), Hanson (Vice Chairman), Ashcraft, Beilenson, Belotti, Britschgi, Collier, Conrad, Davis, Greene, Kennick, Lanterman, Meyers, Mills, Mulford, Petris, Porter, Thelin, Waldie, Williamson, and Winton.

Agriculture Committee (one or more farm labor bills may be assigned to this committee): Williamson (Chairman), Hinckley (Vice Chairman), Belotti, Britschgi, Burton, Duffy, Garrigus, Gonsalves, H. Johnson, Pattee, Porter, Powers, Veneman, Veysey, and Winton.

* * * * *

SENATE COMMITTEES

Insurance and Financial Institutions (will hear Unemployment bills): Dolwig (Chairman), Bradley (Vice Chairman), Burns, Collier, Grunsky, Lunardi, Miller, Short, Sturgeon.

Labor (hears minimum wage and collective bargaining bills): Holmdahl (Chairman), Schrade (Vice Chairman), McAteer, Rodda, Way.

Agriculture (may hear minimum wage bill): O'Sullivan (Chairman), Way (Vice Chairman), Cobey, Donnelly, Geddes, Lagomarsino, McCarthy, Quirk, Rattigan, Sedgwick, Stiern, Sturgeon, Williams.

Governmental Efficiency (any bill may be sent here): : Gibson (Chairman), Burns (Vice Chairman), Arnold, Begovich, Collier, Dolwig, Lagomarsino, McAteer, McCarthy, Short, Teale.

Finance (hears bills with appropriations): Miller (Chairman), Teale (Vice Chairman), Arnold, Burns, Christensen, Cobey, Collier, Dolwig, Donnelly, Gibson, McAteer, Rees, Short.

*since Unemployment Insurance is financed at the federal level (for administration and surveillance), U.I. bills do not have to be heard by this committee.

ACHIEVING EQUAL RIGHTS FOR AGRICULTURAL WORKERS:

How YOU should help.

--The piece of major legislation with the best chance of passage this session is Unemployment Insurance for farm workers. Two bills which would authorize this have already been introduced.

--When a bill is introduced, it is read on the floor of either the Assembly or the Senate and it is then referred to an appropriate committee to be studied. First it goes to a sub-committee of a full committee. The sub-committee studies the bill and it can: hold the bill, send the bill on with a "do pass" recommendation, send the bill on with no recommendation. The full committee then studies the bill and there are hearings on the bill held. If the full committee passes on the bill, then it can go on to the full meeting of either the Assembly or the Senate. If it passes the full House, then the bill can go over to the other House. There it goes through the same process.

--Every legislator must be convinced that farm workers should be covered by unemployment insurance--this is where you come in. The Unemployment Insurance bills have been introduced on the Assembly side first. They have been referred to the Assembly Committee on Finance and Insurance. Look on the next three pages. There is a list of the members of this Committee and there is a roster with the names of the Senators and Assemblymen for each part of California. (If you can't figure out who your Assemblyman or Senator is, call your County Clerk's Office) IF YOUR ASSEMBLYMAN IS ON THE COMMITTEE TO STUDY UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FOR FARM WORKERS, WRITE TO HIM NOW AND TELL HIM WHAT YOU THINK ABOUT THIS. (If you want ideas about what to say, read the article which follows this special insert) YOU SHOULD DO THIS RIGHT NOW.

--The Unemployment Insurance bill will be harder to pass through the Senate side, assuming it passes through the Assembly side. Look and see if YOUR Senator is on the Insurance and Financial Institutions Committee. If he is, WRITE TO HIM RIGHT NOW TELLING HIM WHAT YOU THINK. In fact, write to your Senator now and begin to let him know you want this legislation, because eventually this bill may come up to the full Senate for a vote.

--How to Write: write your senator or assemblyman simply with his name and State Capitol, Sacramento. Or, go to his office on Friday of some week--most of them are at home on Fridays. Talk to him about this legislation.

--Any Questions: write to: LEGISLATION, Box 1173, Berkeley, California.

--If you live in an area where your senator or assemblyman is on the Insurance Committee that decides on Unemployment Insurance, you have a very important job. Get your friends and neighbors to write too, or take a group to talk to him, or plan to go to Sacramento for a day and talk with various members of the committee including your own representative.

--We will let you know more, as there are important things to do. For now, study the article on Insurance and rip these four pages out of FARM LABOR and keep them handy.

FOR READERS IN ALL 50 STATES: IF YOU ARE GLAD THAT WILLARD WIRTZ HAS NOT LET FOREIGN FARM WORKERS COME IN THIS YEAR, HE SHOULD KNOW THIS. LOTS OF PEOPLE WHO WANT FOREIGN WORKERS IN ARE WRITING HIM. YOU CAN SEND A PUBLIC OPINION TELEGRAM TO WIRTZ, U.S. SECRETARY OF LABOR, WASHINGTON, D.C. FOR 75¢.

MEMBERS OF THE CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY, DISTRICT, SENATORS, COUNTIES, PARTIES.

(Tear out and SAVE)

Assembly: District, Assemblyman		Counties	Senate: Senator, District
1	Frank P. Belotti-R	Del Norte	Randolph Collier-D 2
		Humboldt	Carl L. Christensen, Jr.-D 3
		Lake	Frank S. Petersen-D 4
		Mendocino	
2	Pauline L. Davis-D	Lassen	Stanley Arnold-D 1
		Modoc	
		Plumas	
		Shasta	VACANCY 5
		Trinity	
		Sierra	Paul J. Lunardi-D 7
		Siskiyou	Randolph Collier-D 2
		Tehama	Virgil O'Sullivan-D 8
3	Leroy F. Greene-D	Sacramento	Albert S. Rodda-D 19
4	Ray E. Johnson-R	Butte	Stan Pittman-R 6
		Colusa	Virgil O'Sullivan-D 8
		Glenn	
		Sutter	Harold T. Sedgwick-R 10
		Yolo	Samuel R. Geddes-D 11
5	Pearce Young-D	Napa	Samuel R. Geddes-D 11
		Solano	Luther E. Gibson-D 15
6	Eugene A. Chappie-R	Alpine	
		Inyo	William Symons, Jr.-R 28
		Mono	
		Amador	
		El Dorado	John C. Begovich-D 9
		Calaveras	
		Mariposa	Stephen P. Teale-D 26
		Tuolumne	
		Nevada	Paul H. Lunardi-D 7
		Placer	
		Yuba	Harold T. Sedgwick-R 10
7	William T. Bagley-R	Marin	John F. McCarthy-R 13
		Sonoma	Joseph A. Rattigan-D 12
8	Walter W. Powers-D	Sacramento	Albert S. Rodda-D 19
9	Edwin L. Z'berg-D		
10	Jerome R. Waldie-D	Contra Costa	George Miller, Jr.-D 17
11	John T. Knox-D		
12	Robert T. Monagan-R	San Joaquin	Alan Short-D 20
13	Carlos Bee-D		
14	Robert W. Crown-D		
15	Nicholas C. Petris-D	Alameda	John W. Holmdahl-D 16
16	Don Mulford-R		
17	Wm. Byron Rumford-D		
18	Willie L. Brown, Jr.-D		
19	Charles W. Meyers-D	San Francisco	J. Eugene McAteer-D 14
20	John Burton-D		
21	Milton Marks-R		
22	George W. Miliars-R	Santa Clara	Clark L. Bradley-R 18
23	John F. Foran-D	San Francisco	J. Eugene McAteer-D 14
24	Alfred E. Alquist-D	Santa Clara	Clark L. Bradley-R 18
25	William F. Stanton-D		
26	Carl A. Britschgi-R	San Mateo	Richard J. Dolwig-R 21
27	Leo J. Ryan-D		

28 Jack T. Casey-D	Kern	Walter W. Stiern-D	34
29 John C. Williamson-D			
30 John T. Veneman-R	Stanislaus	Hugh P. Donnelly-D	22
31 Gordon H. Winton, Jr.-D	Merced	James A. Cobey-D	24
	Madera		
	San Benito	Donald L. Grunsky-R	23
32 George N. Zenovich-D	Fresno	Hugh M. Burns-D	30
33 Charles B. Garrigus-D			
34 Alan G. Pattee-R	Monterey	Fred S. Farr-D	25
	Santa Cruz	Donald L. Grunsky-R	23
35 Gordon W. Duffy-R	Kings	Robert D. Williams-D	27
	Tulare	Howard Way-R	32
36 Winfield A. Shoemaker-D	San Luis Obispo	Vernon L. Sturgeon-R	29
	Santa Barbara	Alvin C. Weingand-D	31
	Ventura	Robert J. Lagomarsino-R	33
37 Burt M. Henson-D			
38 Carley V. Porter-D			
39 George Deukmejian-R			
40 Edward E. Elliott-D			
41 Tom C. Carrell-D			
42 Bob Moretti-D			
43 Howard J. Thelin-R			
44 Joseph M. Kennick-D			
45 Alfred H. Song-D			
46 Charles Edward Chapel-R			
47 Frank Lanterman-R			
48 George E. Danielson-D			
49 Houston I. Flournoy-R			
50 Philip L. Soto-D			
51 Jack R. Fenton-D			
52 George A. Willson-D			
53 Mervyn M. Dymally-D	Los Angeles	Thomas M. Rees-D	38
54 John L. E. Collier-R			
55 F. Douglas Ferrell-D			
56 Charles Warren-D			
57 Charles J. Conrad-R			
58 Harvey Johnson-D			
59 Anthony C. Beilenson-D			
60 Robert S. Stevens-R			
61 Lester A. McMillan-D			
62 Newton R. Russell-R			
63 Don A. Allen, Sr.-D			
64 Lou A. Cusanovich-R			
65 Jesse M. Unruh-D			
66 Joe A. Gonsalves-D			
67 Clayton A. Dills-D			
68 Vincent Thomas-R			
69 William E. Dannemeyer-D			
70 James E. Whetmore-R	Orange	John G. Schmitz-R	35
71 Robert E. Badham-R			
72 John B. Quimby-D			
73 Stewart Hinckley-R	San Bernardino	Eugene G. Nisbet-D	36
74 Craig W. Biddle-R	Riverside	Gordon Cologne-R	37
75 Victor V. Veysey-R	Imperial	Aaron W. Quick-D	39
76 Clair W. Burgener-R			
77 Richard J. Donovan-R			
78 E. Richard Barnes-R	San Diego	Jack Schrade-R	40
79 James R. Mills-D			
80 Hale Ashcraft-R			

MEMBERS OF THE CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY, DISTRICT, SENATORS, COUNTIES, PARTIES.

(Tear out and SAVE)

Assembly: District, Assemblyman		Counties	Senate: Senator, District	
1	Frank P. Belotti-R	Del Norte	Randolph Collier-D	2
		Humboldt	Carl L. Christensen, Jr.-D	3
		Lake	Frank S. Petersen-D	4
		Mendocino		
2	Pauline L. Davis-D	Lassen	Stanley Arnold-D	1
		Modoc		
		Plumas		
		Shasta	VACANCY	5
		Trinity		
		Sierra	Paul J. Lunardi-D	7
		Siskiyou	Randolph Collier-D	2
		Tehama	Virgil O'Sullivan-D	8
3	Leroy F. Greene-D	Sacramento	Albert S. Rodda-D	19
4	Ray E. Johnson-R	Butte	Stan Pittman-R	6
		Colusa	Virgil O'Sullivan-D	8
		Glenn		
		Sutter	Harold T. Sedgwick-R	10
		Yolo	Samuel R. Geddes-D	11
5	Pearce Young-D	Napa	Samuel R. Geddes-D	11
		Solano	Luther E. Gibson-D	15
6	Eugene A. Chappie-R	Alpine		
		Inyo	William Symons, Jr.-R	28
		Mono		
		Amador		
		El Dorado	John C. Begovich-D	9
		Calaveras		
		Mariposa	Stephen P. Teale-D	26
		Tuolumne		
		Nevada	Paul H. Lunardi-D	7
		Placer		
		Yuba	Harold T. Sedgwick-R	10
7	William T. Bagley-R	Marin	John F. McCarthy-R	13
		Sonoma	Joseph A. Rattigan-D	12
8	Walter W. Powers-D	Sacramento	Albert S. Rodda-D	19
9	Edwin L. Z'berg-D			
10	Jerome R. Waldie-D	Contra Costa	George Miller, Jr.-D	17
11	John T. Knox-D			
12	Robert T. Monagan-R	San Joaquin	Alan Short-D	20
13	Carlos Bee-D			
14	Robert W. Crown-D			
15	Nicholas G. Petris-D	Alameda	John W. Holmdahl-D	16
16	Don Mulford-R			
17	Wm. Byron Rumford-D			
18	Willie L. Brown, Jr.-D			
19	Charles W. Meyers-D	San Francisco	J. Eugene McAteer-D	14
20	John Burton-D			
21	Milton Marks-R			
22	George W. Miliias-R	Santa Clara	Clark L. Bradley-R	18
23	John F. Foran-D	San Francisco	J. Eugene McAteer-D	14
24	Alfred E. Alquist-D	Santa Clara	Clark L. Bradley-R	18
25	William F. Stanton-D			
26	Carl A. Britschgi-R	San Mateo	Richard J. Dolwig-R	21
27	Leo J. Ryan-D			

28 Jack T. Casey-D	Kern	Walter W. Stiern-D	34
29 John C. Williamson-D			
30 John T. Veneman-R	Stanislaus	Hugh P. Donnelly-D	22
31 Gordon H. Winton, Jr.-D	Merced	James A. Cobey-D	24
	Madera		
	San Benito	Donald L. Grunsky-R	23
32 George N. Zenovich-D	Fresno	Hugh M. Burns-D	30
33 Charles B. Garrigus-D			
34 Alan G. Pattee-R	Monterey	Fred S. Farr-D	25
	Santa Cruz	Donald L. Grunsky-R	23
35 Gordon W. Duffy-R	Kings	Robert D. Williams-D	27
	Tulare	Howard Way-R	32
36 Winfield A. Shoemaker-D	San Luis Obispo	Vernon L. Sturgeon-R	29
	Santa Barbara	Alvin C. Weingand-D	31
	Ventura	Robert J. Iagomarsino-R	33
37 Burt M. Henson-D			
38 Carley V. Porter-D			
39 George Deukmejian-R			
40 Edward E. Elliott-D			
41 Tom C. Carrell-D			
42 Bob Moretti-D			
43 Howard J. Thelin-R			
44 Joseph M. Kennick-D			
45 Alfred H. Song-D			
46 Charles Edward Chapel-R			
47 Frank Lanterman-R			
48 George E. Danielson-D			
49 Houston I. Flournoy-R			
50 Philip L. Soto-D			
51 Jack R. Fenton-D			
52 George A. Willson-D			
53 Mervyn M. Dymally-D	Los Angeles	Thomas M. Rees-D	38
54 John L. E. Collier-R			
55 F. Douglas Ferrell-D			
56 Charles Warren-D			
57 Charles J. Conrad-R			
58 Harvey Johnson-D			
59 Anthony C. Beilenson-D			
60 Robert S. Stevens-R			
61 Lester A. McMillan-D			
62 Newton R. Russell-R			
63 Don A. Allen, Sr.-D			
64 Lou A. Cusanovich-R			
65 Jesse M. Unruh-D			
66 Joe A. Gonsalves-D			
67 Clayton A. Dills-D			
68 Vincent Thomas-R			
69 William E. Dannemeyer-D			
70 James E. Whetmore-R	Orange	John G. Schmitz-R	35
71 Robert E. Badham-R			
72 John B. Quimby-D			
73 Stewart Hinckley-R	San Bernardino	Eugene G. Nisbet-D	36
74 Craig W. Biddle-R	Riverside	Gordon Cologne-R	37
75 Victor V. Veysey-R	Imperial	Aaron W. Quick-D	39
76 Clair W. Burgener-R			
77 Richard J. Donovan-R			
78 E. Richard Barnes-R	San Diego	Jack Schrade-R	40
79 James E. Mills-D			
80 Hale Ashcraft-R			

At a Farm Labor Legislative Conference held in Goshen last November, it was the consensus of 12 representative organizations that Unemployment Insurance for farm workers should have top priority this year in Sacramento. Unemployment Insurance is the major farm labor bill with the best chance of passage, because, among other reasons, it has been most extensively discussed. The article which follows is an excerpt from testimony before the State Senate Fact-Finding Committee on Labor and Welfare (the "Cobey Committee"), in Fresno, January 26, 1960. The basic arguments are as relevant as ever. But since 1960 one important new form of evidence has emerged. The inclusion of farm laborers under Disability Insurance in 1961 has demonstrated, once and for all, that employee records, payroll deductions, and benefit disbursements are administratively feasible in the industry of agriculture, as in any other.

THE INSURANCE PRINCIPLE AND THE DEAD HAND

1. Introduction

California was one of the first states in the union to pass an Unemployment Insurance Act, doing so in 1935, even before the passage of the national Social Security Act which facilitated this type of social insurance. However, there are some important respects in which California's present Unemployment Insurance Act is less "liberal" than such laws in many other states. For example, 44 states have less stringent requirements than California as regards the minimum earnings which confer eligibility for unemployment insurance.

Of even greater concern is the fact that California presently excludes several major classes of workers from this vital form of social legislation. There are close to a million government employees in California.¹ Perhaps 150,000 persons work as domestics in private households. At least 75,000 persons are employed by nonprofit institutions, such as churches. All these employees are excluded from unemployment insurance. Other, numerically smaller, exclusions include student nurses, jockeys, caddies, certain salesmen and brokers, election campaign workers, hospital interns, student employees of schools and colleges, news vendors, and baseball players.

Of particular interest to the present discussion, nearly 600,000 individuals work for wages in California agriculture at some time during the year.² We should like to emphasize the fact that agriculture, alone among the major exclusions, is an industry, which in common with all industries, operates for profit. How can the exclusion of the agricultural industry be justified? Apparently, the principal reasons for continued exclusion of farm workers from the California Unemployment Insurance Act are: 1) Alleged administrative obstacles; 2) alleged financial obstacles; 3) the sheer weight of tradition. Let us examine each of these three rationales.

¹ Includes federal, state, county, municipal, and special district (including school district) employees. Excludes members of the armed forces.

² Does not include over 100,000 foreign contract workers.

2. Administrative

The administrative problems which would accompany the extension of unemployment insurance to agricultural workers are admittedly considerable. In a disorganized farm labor market, many agricultural employers and contractors have traditionally had only the vaguest notions of how many persons worked for them during a given period, who they were, where they came from, where they went, how much they earned, or anything else. Similarly, many agricultural workers have had only the vaguest notions of whom they worked for during a given season, how much they earned, and so forth.

Challenging as the administrative problems might be, we are certain they are not insoluble. For one thing, we would point to the lessons which the bracero program teaches. Although this program has had many deeply damaging effects, it has proved useful in one respect: it has demonstrated beyond cavil that agricultural employers can, if they wish, maintain records of employees, hours, gross earnings, deductions, and other pertinent information.¹ We would point, secondly, to a report prepared by the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security in 1951, even before the bracero program had conclusively demonstrated the feasibility of farm labor record-keeping. After reviewing in detail each of the administrative problems of covering agriculture, Bureau of Employment Security analysts concluded that administrative procedures could be developed to meet every difficulty.²

Furthermore, it may come as a surprise to many persons to learn that as of December 8, 1959, 688 commercial farms in California were covered by unemployment insurance. (Any employer who falls within an excluded category may join the system on an elective basis.) Of these 688 farms, 499 had been covered sufficiently long to build up an "experience rating." Newly covered businesses are required to contribute to the Unemployment Insurance Fund at a fixed rate for three years, after which their contributions to the fund are measured against their employees' benefits, and they are assigned a rating which determines their future level of contributions. An industry with very little employee turnover makes almost negligible contributions. Highly seasonal industries have to contribute at a statutory maximum.³

The contributions of the 499 "rated" agricultural employers ranged between 0.3% and 2.7% of payroll, with the median being 1.3%. Interestingly enough, this was precisely the average contribution of all covered employers in the State in 1957. Now, to be sure, it may safely be assumed that the 688 farms which have chosen to participate in the unemployment insurance system are, for the most part, dairy farms which offer more stable (!) employment than the average fruit or vegetable farm.⁴ Nonetheless, these 688 farms teach a valuable lesson: there is nothing intrinsic to agriculture per se which precludes the creation of administrative techniques suited to unemployment insurance coverage.

3. Fiscal

The casual observer may assume that most agricultural labor is so highly seasonal that the entire concept of unemployment insurance becomes inapplicable, on actuarial grounds. Let us examine this assumption with some care.

1 It has demonstrated, also, that growers can guarantee steady employment for a minimum of six months, when they care to.

2 U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Extension of Unemployment Insurance Coverage to Farm Labor. Washington, D.C., 1951.

3 At the present time (1965), the maximum is 3.5%.

4 Dairy owners have no doubt "chosen" to participate at the insistence of their employees, who are among the few farm workers covered by union contracts.

The truth is that California agriculture, taken as a whole, is less seasonal than a number of industries which have long been successfully covered by the state Unemployment Insurance Act. In 1959, for example, the number of hired farm workers at the year's peak in September was estimated by the Farm Placement Service at 408,660; the number at the year's low point in March was estimated at 230,140. Expressed in terms of index numbers, based on the year's average, farm employment varied from a low of 72 to a high of 128.¹ These index numbers should be compared with the following from other industries.

Table 1

Industry	Peak Index	Low Index
Fruit and vegetable canning	141	49
Contract sorting, grading, and packing of citrus fruits	190	44
Contract sorting, grading, and packing of noncitrus fruits and vegetables	162	49
Wholesale trade, farm products	131	70
Pine logging and sawmills	132	48
Trailer parks and camps	141	58
Street and highway construction	126	74

SOURCE: California Department of Employment, "California Employment and Payrolls," 1958 quarterly reports.

In terms of ratio between high and low employment, these industries are as much as two and a half times more seasonal than agriculture. Workers in industries such as these receive unemployment insurance benefit payments at rates far above the state average. In 1957, for example, total benefits from the Unemployment Insurance Fund averaged 1.3% of taxable payrolls. This figure may be compared with the corresponding figures from certain seasonal industries in that same year.

Table 2

Industry	Benefit Payments as Percent of Taxable Wages
Canning and preserving fruits and vegetables	11.2
Contract sorting, grading, and packing of citrus fruits	11.0
Logging	10.2
Assembling of noncitrus fruits and vegetables	9.5
Contract sorting, grading, and packing of noncitrus fruits and vegetables	8.3
Assembling of citrus fruits	7.3
Fishing	6.8
Canning and preserving seafoods	6.8

SOURCE: California Department of Employment. Report 352, #13. August 28, 1958.

These high benefit rates are not the aberrations of a single year. Other data from the state Department of Employment show that industries such as these have always drawn far more from the Unemployment Insurance Fund than they have contributed to it. For example, the canning industry, by June 30, 1958, had drawn \$91,140,866 more from the Fund than it had contributed. This "deficit reserve", as it is called, mounts

¹ More recent data suggest the disparity may be even smaller. The Disability Insurance system -- presumably more accurate than Farm Placement Service estimates -- reported 296,601 employees covered in September, 1963 (high for the year), and 176,026 in February (low for the year). The index numbers were 75 and 125, respectively.

higher every year. In fiscal 1958, for instance, the 89 operators who make up the California canning industry paid wages of \$119,738,287; they made contributions to the Unemployment Insurance Fund of \$3,214,491; charges on the fund for this industry totalled \$14,512,644.

The packingshed industry is proportionately even farther in arrears, with a "deficit reserve" of \$20,420,711 in 1958, compared to a total annual payroll of less than \$15,000,000, and contributions to the Fund running only a fourth to a third of withdrawals. This kind of imbalance is by no means peculiar to the industries which cluster around agriculture. In heavy construction, unemployment insurance contributions average about one-third of the benefits workers receive. In the outerwear division of the ladies' garment industry, charges against the Fund are more than five times as great as the contributions of employers.

Now, we do not mean to suggest by these types of statistics that highly seasonal industries, such as garment making, construction, logging, fishing, and canning, should be removed from the Unemployment Insurance Act, or should be penalized in any other way. Quite the contrary. We have presented this type of evidence to illustrate a fundamental insurance principle: some insurance-holders have different experience records from others, no matter what type of insurance is involved. The entire point of having insurance -- particularly social insurance -- is to spread risks and costs over as broad a base as possible in order that unusual experience records may be absorbed with relatively little hardship to any one group.

If this principle has been accepted with respect to industries as seasonal as those we have been discussing, there is obviously no actuarial justification for the continued exclusion of agriculture.

4. The Dead Hand

Agricultural workers deserve coverage by unemployment insurance more than any other group of industrial workers. The average agricultural laborer is unemployed about two-thirds of the days of the year. In this, he is similar to the average cannery worker, say. But he labors under additional handicaps which neither cannery workers, nor loggers, nor fishermen, nor any other group of seasonal workers do: his wages, when he is able to find work, are grievously depressed through a combination of foreign contract labor systems, exclusion from the Fair Labor Standards Act, and exclusion from collective bargaining machinery. As a result, it is simply impossible for the average farm worker to earn enough while he is working to tide him and his family over the times that he is unemployed. If he can meet residence requirements, he goes on relief. If he cannot meet the requirements, God alone knows or cares how he survives.

We have discussed both the alleged administrative obstacles and alleged fiscal obstacles to coverage of farm workers by unemployment insurance. Neither of these difficulties is nearly so formidable as the farm lobby would have one believe. The only remaining argument for continued exclusion seems to be that "it has always been done." Conservatives will no doubt continue to capitalize on the dead hand of tradition in their attempts to prevent significant amendment of the California Unemployment Insurance Act.

We trust that this sort of argument, which is really no argument at all, will crumble under the weight of accumulating economic and administrative evidence, and under the weight of the collective conscience of the people of California.

In past issues of FARM LABOR, we have discussed a variety of foreign and offshore labor schemes, including Basques, Japanese, Filipinos, British West Indians, Puerto Ricans, "green carders", Public Law 78 braceros, and Public Law 414 visaros. In addition to all these, there is an arrangement operating massively in border areas right now which operates to the disadvantage of domestic farm workers as surely as any of the better known foreign labor systems. Henry Munoz, author of the following account of the border-crossing loophole in the immigration laws, was a principal organizer of the Crystal City, Texas, movement in which Mexican-Americans for the first time began to vote in proportion to their numbers. At the present time, Munoz is director of the Texas AFL-CIO's Department of Equal Opportunity. This paper was solicited from Munoz as background material for participants in the National Conference on Poverty in Tucson.

THE PROBLEM OF BORDER CROSSERS---commuters

by Henry Munoz, Jr.

Utter the word "commuter" in a United States metropolitan area and it triggers a vision of the man in gray flannel, seated in a train or bus, newspaper propped before him, headed to or from his suburban home from or to his job in the central city. But along the international boundary stretching westward from Brownsville, Texas to San Diego, California--the United States-Mexico border--the "commuter" is quite another person. Along this border a "commuter" is a citizen of Mexico--a resident of a Mexican city or town just south of the border--who daily "commutes" to a job in a U.S. border city or town, returning home each night to his Mexican home.

The Citizens of Mexico. How many such border commuters are there? Estimates vary--because no official agency keeps careful records of such commuters. But Texas AFL-CIO, after three years of intensive study of the situation, believes that as many as 100,000 Mexican citizens fall into the commuter category. The majority of them cross into Texas: Upwards of 65,000 each day. Most of the balance crosses into California. With the exception of Nogales, Arizona, port of entry, there is little or no commuter traffic across the Arizona and New Mexico southern boundaries. Nor are there U.S. cities or towns of size sufficient to attract commuters in southern Arizona and New Mexico.

What attracts commuters from Mexico to Texas and California? They are attracted--or pushed northward--as anonymous pawns in an economic chess game. The commuter comes out of one of the most poverty stricken areas in the Western Hemisphere--an arid, undeveloped and overpopulated country remote from his own nation's capital, out of sight to his nation's politicians, living a largely hand-to-mouth existence as a tenant farmer, an itinerant farm hand or as a worker in the tourist-oriented enterprises of Mexican northern frontier communities. For such a man, the cities of southern California and Texas--Brownsville, McAllen, Harlingen, Laredo, Del Rio, El Paso, El Centro, San Diego--beckon.

And he begins to commute--to jobs in American border communities--100,000 of him.

It is a classic economic situation. U.S. employers--because of a loophole in U.S. immigration law allowing the unrestricted entrance of commuters--have access to a virtually unlimited pool of workers. And they are hungry workers--literally hungry. They can and do work at wages and under conditions intolerable to U.S. citizens. They can do this for a very simple reason: in the undeveloped economy of northern border Mexico living costs, by comparison with U.S. costs, are low. One American dollar equals twelve and one-half Mexican pesos. An American worker cannot begin to live on his side of the border for the kind of wages which will keep a commuter's body and soul together in the lower-cost area where he lives. Not that the commuter is highly-paid; he is far from that. But he can and does underbid the U.S. worker in the labor market. In business after business along the Texas border--in garment factory, in food processing plants, in ore smelter, on the shrimp-packing dock, in the retail and service establishment--employers hire the commuter before they hire the U.S. citizen, because he will work cheaper.

What's the effect on the U.S. worker and his community of this unrestricted (and growing) in-flow of cheap labor? Wages and working conditions deteriorate: For the past five years, the unemployment rate in Texas cities along the Rio Grande has been far in excess of both the state and national unemployment rate, soaring at times to as much as 15 per cent. for periods as long as 20 to 30 months.

Nearly half a million Texas workers are still getting paid 1875 wages--when they can find work. They have yet to receive fruits of mechanization or feel the beneficial hand of their government. They, in effect, are not really free men and women because of their economic impoverishment. The Texas AFL-CIO is concerned and has been for many years, that representatives in local, state and federal government have shown so little sympathy for this group of workers who must support over ten percent of the population of this state. They do not have their right to join a union for protection. They are not protected by a minimum wage and hour law. They have no workmen's injury or unemployment insurance. They get only two kinds of assistance: (1) As an aid primarily to the agri-business industry, the Texas Employment Commission sets up migrant schedules and helps coordinate the migrant farm worker flow; and (2) They get welfare in some Texas counties. Is it any wonder that these people have the poorest health, worst illiteracy rate, the sorriest citizenship participation of any group in the nation? Importation of more alien farm workers and commuters will just further aggravate these conditions.

A serious problem in the economy of Texas today is that its per capita personal income as percent of the national average is declining. Though Texas is now the fifth most populous and six most industrial state in the nation, we are nearly \$400 below the national average in per capita income. Last year, we were \$350 below; the year before, we were nearly \$300 below. This is a dangerous economic trend. The average migrant farm worker making less than \$1,000 a year contributes much to this economic malady. The majority of most of the families in the counties in which the migrants reside have less than \$3,500 per year income. These are the main victims of this nation's bracero and commuter policies, but their fellow citizens who must assume increased taxes also suffer due to this great community of low-paid workers.

****Example of the commuter effect:** In February 1964, as the early-morning peak load of commuters walked and drove northward over the international bridge from Nuevo Laredo, Tamp., Mex. to Laredo, Texas, an anonymous caller told customs officials that a bomb had been planted on the bridge. Commuter traffic was halted while the span was searched. A total of 3600 commuters was counted. On that very day, in Laredo, according to the local Texas Employment Commission, more than 4000 U.S. citizens were unemployed.

A team of U.S. Labor Department lawyers and investigators, after probing the situation in Laredo in 1961, filed a report in which they called working conditions and wages in Laredo, because of the commuter traffic, so poor as to be "symbolic of peonage". Wages as low as \$20 for a 96-hour week for hotel hall boys, \$60 a month for hotel maids, \$25 a week for drug store cashiers, \$17 a week for grocery checkers were cited in the Labor Department's Laredo report and in a similar report on El Paso. The El Paso report concluded that "the willingness of the commuter alien to work for the possibly substandard wages necessarily impairs the domestic power to bargain for better rates." (For more details see U.S. Labor Department reports and a copy of Texas AFL-CIO's petition for writ of certiorari from the U.S. Supreme Court, October term, 1963, in a mandamus action brought against the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service).

In short, the Mexican commuter is cruelly and viciously exploited by U.S. border employers. Equally cruelly and viciously exploited is the U.S. border community worker who must accept the depressed wages and working conditions caused by the presence of the commuter or leave his home for another part of the nation. And there is apparently no protection for either the commuter or the U.S. citizen worker in the laws of either Mexico or the U.S., and no international agreements between the two nations concern themselves with the workers' plight. Texas AFL-CIO reached this decision after viewing the developments that followed the filing, in late 1961, of a lawsuit aimed at halting the commuter traffic.

The lawsuit, a mandamus action, was brought in a District of Columbia Federal District Court against the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Department (and against the U.S. Attorney General, since the department is an arm of the Justice Department). The suit relied on an earlier Federal District Court ruling in which a judge characterized the issuance of visas to commuters as immigrants "lawfully admitted for permanent residence" (Still the practice of Immigration and Naturalization), as an "amiable fiction" without standing in immigration law. Texas AFL-CIO in Austin received a verbal complaint from the Mexican counsel and was informed that the Mexican ambassador to the U.S. complained at the highest Washington level against the possibility of shutting down commuter traffic. The gist of the Mexican official complaint was to the effect that the commuter traffic earned for Mexico approximately \$50 million dollars yearly in hard U.S. dollars.

The U.S. reply to this complaint came when the suit was heard in the Federal District Court and an affidavit for the defendants was presented. The affidavit came from Secretary of State Dean Rusk and said--in effect--that should Texas AFL-CIO halt commuter traffic by winning the suit, the relations of the U.S. with Mexico would suffer. The suit went to the U.S. Supreme Court on appeal from adverse rulings in District and Circuit Court of Appeals. Though never tried on its merits, the Supreme Court refused a hearing of the action. The next step is, Texas AFL-CIO believes, obvious: The Congress must be asked to cure the situation by appropriate and specific legislation--and international agreements must be sought with Mexico. These routes ought to lead to control

of the commuter traffic, for example strengthening the administrative hand of the Labor Department to halt commuters when there is "adverse effect" on U.S. labor, an international minimum wage agreement between the U.S. and Mexico (Texas has no state minimum wage requirement, worsening the effect of commuters in Texas as compared to California), the application of the whole spectrum of fair labor standards to the international worker.

Texas AFL-CIO does not seek to close U.S. borders to alien workers--but would wish to achieve and safeguard wages and other working standards for both native and alien labor.

In summary, the commuter problem boils down to this:

About 100,000 Mexican nationals compete with U.S. labor in a labor market already badly low-grade in comparison with other U.S. areas.

Both the U.S. and the alien worker are exploited and, in effect, the worker bears on his back the responsibility for maintaining our diplomatic relationship with Mexico.

This is properly a subject for study and action by the Congress, the appropriate branches of the Executive Department, by Texas and national AFL-CIO--and, most importantly, by joint bodies of U.S. and Mexican organized labor.

* * * * *

reprint from: CARTA EDITORIAL, Los Angeles, February 8, 1965. "If the conditions are intolerable to the workers of the U.S., we are sure that they are equally intolerable to the workers who live in Mexico. So it follows that these people will join hands with the U.S. workers to improve the wage rates now prevailing in Texas and in some areas of California. It appears that labor in Mexico is finally awakening to this possibility. A program to unionize the thousands of border commuters has been announced by Felipe Valencia, Secretary of the C.T.M., Tijuana, Baja California, Mexico. He states that they will co-operate with the AFL-CIO to organize these workers. As a result of a meeting between the two labor groups in Mexico City, it was decided to send international labor councils to nine U.S. Mexican border communities to deal with the problems of these workers and to promote trade unions to protect workers on both sides of the border."

* * * * *

A Catholic priest in Northern California recently received the following letter from a Mexican worker, father of 7 children, who now lives 70 miles southeast of Mexicali:

"I would like to be able to come to the United States to work so I can help my family. Some people have come with just a visitor's permit and have worked as long as six months, but they have acquaintances or relatives there. I have a passport but I can't convince myself to go, because I'm afraid the government will arrest me for being an 'illegal' because my passport is only for shopping or visiting friends. But many people are going; they can't go as braceros anymore, but they say that no one bothers you when they find you working with this kind of visitor's passport because there is a labor shortage now because the President of Mexico doesn't want any more bracero contracting. I would like you to inform me if I should go...."

CALIFORNIA'S INDUSTRIAL WELFARE COMMISSION: A Public Hearing.

--In the October 1964 issue of FARM LABOR, Mrs. Anne Draper described the workings of the California I.W.C. and pointed out its historical discrimination against women and minors working in the industry of agriculture. IN November 1964, the I.W.C. Wage Board concluded a series of meetings with a tie-breaking vote by Chairman Dr. Earl Cheit; the Board authorized recommendations which would bring I.W.C. rulings for women and minors in agriculture closer into line with those for women and minors in other industries.

--Public hearings are now being held to gather facts and opinions on the Wage Board's recommendations. A flyer produced by Mrs. Dorothy Kauffman, employee representative to the Wage Board, explains the hearing and the demands requested by farm workers and their friends. The flyer is reproduced below. Readers in the Fresno and Sacramento areas are encouraged to attend the hearings this week.

 "The Wage Board has met and recommended several improvements in the wage order law for women and minors who work in agriculture:

- a. Increase the minimum wage to \$1.30 an hour for women. (it used to be \$1.)
- b. Piece work must guarantee \$1.30 an hour for women. (it used to be 50¢)
- c. Give 4 hours reporting time pay. (it used to be 2 hours' pay)
- d. Extend protection to more women and minors by making law relevant wherever 5 or more women are working. (it used to be 10)
- e. Have better toilets and washing facilities and drinking water.
- f. Have better law enforcement.
- g. Keep better records for workers of their hours and wages.
- h. Make the Wage Order available in Spanish.

"You can make sure that these changes become the new law. The Industrial Welfare Commission (I.W.C.) is holding public hearings in;

FRESNO-Tuesday March 2, 10 am
 2550 Mariposa Street
 in the assembly room

SACRAMENTO-Thursday March 4, 10 am
 1419 9th Street
 in the auditorium

SPEAK AND THE I.W.C. WILL LISTEN
 WAGE ORDERS ARE THE LAW

GROWERS MUST OBEY THEM

YOU CAN HELP GET BETTER LAWS"

 ---"An estimated 14 million women 16 years of age and over are among the 35 million persons living in poverty in the United States...." U.S. Dept. Labor News.

--"Mothers are being hired here to do farm labor and are proving better workers than the usual transient male laborers, a state official said.... 'The growers think they're great' said (Jerry) Smith (of the Dept. Employment Office). 'They're not as fast as braceros, of course, but...I expect we'll have 150 of the mothers in the fields within three weeks and up to 300 during melon season.' ...a child care center will be set up soon...." L.A. Times, 2/6/65. Dateline: Blythe.

--Many people refuse to get excited about the I.W.C. order for farm women because it is so flagrantly violated. The account of one woman's experience as a field hand is reported on the following pages by her companion worker, Mr. Howard Richards. This story documents one time when I.W.C. orders were abided by; but in any case, administrative negligence is not sufficient reason for abandoning a fight for protective legislation.

TOPPING CARROTS NEAR INDIO, JANUARY 20, 1965.

by Howard Richards

"The newspaper is everywhere in America,
but the newspaper is not America."

--Thomas Wolfe

The previous night some farm workers who were living in their cars in a sandy canyon near the All-American Canal had told us the location of the carrot field. We arrived there shortly after seven, and found about one hundred people topping carrots. We asked one of them, a young Negro, who the boss was. The young Negro pointed out a short dark-skinned man with a white hat.

We walked across the field, in and out among the workers, to where the man with the white hat was standing. We didn't say anything to the man in the white hat, and he said only enough to give us a general idea as to where we could find a supply of burlap bags. We picked up bags and began to imitate the actions of the other workers, pulling carrots out of the ground, tearing off the tops, putting them into a large metal funnel, and, when the funnel was full, transferring the carrots into burlap bags. The earth smelled like just-cut grass; the sounds were voices of workers, joking and making fun of each other. ("Just because I'm a tramp, I don't want you calling me one.") The colors were mainly white and green, white sky--a few drops of rain falling through the warm air, white-blue mountains on the horizon, light green tracery of carrot plants--growing darker toward the distance. The worker to my right, a Spanish lady wearing a black shawl, told me not to put any crooked ones or small ones in the bag--she said that if I did my bags would be tipped over and spilled on the ground.

There were 106 workers in the field, 85 men, 14 children, and 7 women. About nine o'clock a young man wearing a good white shirt told the three of us to put slips of paper marked "32" on each bag we filled. He wrote the number "32" in his notebook and beside it "Katy Peake". Toward ten it became harder and harder to find burlap bags; we walked further and further up and down the rows looking for them. Apparently there had been scattered around the field a number of empty bags equal to the number of carrots ordered for the day. About 11:30, the bags ran completely out. "No mas," explained the white-hatted man.

Some of the people left, presumably planning to return later for their pay, but most of us waited around to get paid. At 12:30, it turned out that there was to be more carrot-topping after all, for a truck arrived with more burlap bags. We worked another hour, until the bag supply was again exhausted. Then we waited around for our pay again. If there had been half as many workers, 53, we could have worked twice as long, approximately 8 hours.

We were paid at about four in the afternoon. The rate of pay was 14¢ for a 50 pound bag. But the bags were suspiciously large--we were told later, at the county weights and measures office, that the bags were closer to 100 pound bags. The three of us together made \$4.06. We were at a disadvantage, because we were inexperienced, but we also had an advantage, because we had had a good dinner and a good place to sleep the night before. The average pay was \$3.50 per payroll entry. Considering the many payroll entries that included two, three, or more people, the average pay came out to \$2.30 per person.

At Mrs. Peake's request, an official from the labor commissioner's office arrived on the scene at pay time. He compelled the labor contractor, one Jesus Gonzalez, to pay the women \$4 show-up pay, as required by I.W.C. Order 14. The workers were impressed by the spectacle. Not just the man with the white hat, not just the young man in the good white shirt, but the labor contractor himself brought to heel. Two or three began to talk about a strike. ("We'll get 20¢ a sack. Then we can make a living--by ourselves.")

The next day we went back to the same field. The young man in the good white shirt told us that no carrots were being picked on that day, but that we should come back the next day. We drove into Indio to the Farm Placement Service Office. There a lady with high heels and salt-and-pepper hair told us that Jesus Gonzalez had placed a rush order for more people to pick carrots, but no women.

* * * * *

JOBS WANTED: The U.S. Department of Labor publishes a monthly bulletin entitled "Area Trends in Employment and Unemployment". For January 1965, this bulletin shows that many areas of rural California are currently classified as areas of "Substantial Unemployment", meaning that "unemployment is 6 percent or more of the total work force... (and)...this situation is expected to continue through the next 2 to 4 month period...."

It may be debatable that substantial numbers of the urban unemployed are willing and/or able to perform skilled farm labor jobs, but it seems beyond debate that a substantial number of the rural unemployed are or have been farm workers and would prefer farm work to welfare or unemployment if farm wages enabled them to care for their families as well as or better than social subsistence benefits.

In the following rural California counties, 6% or more of the adult labor force was unemployed during January 1965, the first month of the great labor shortage:

Bakersfield, Kern County
Fresno, Fresno County
Hollister, San Benito County
Lakeport, Lake County
Madera, Madera County
Merced, Merced County
Modesto, Stanislaus County

San Diego, San Diego County
San Jose, Santa Clara County
Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz County
Santa Rosa, Sonoma County
Stockton, San Joaquin County
Visalia, Tulare County
Woodland, Yolo County
Yuba City, Sutter-Yuba Counties

The major labor area in California with the highest rate of unemployment is Stockton, San Joaquin County, with an 8.3 percent unemployment rate. It is from precisely this area that frantic cries of a labor shortage will be coming next month, as the asparagus harvest gathers momentum. There are 8400 unemployed laborers in the Stockton vicinity.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

"Please show this letter to anyone interested in helping the lowest paid, most abused workers in America:

"Last fall I was taken to a cotton field 17 miles out of Fresno. When we were about to start picking, Joe Aguilar the labor contractor told me that he couldn't use. That I was too old and could hurt myself. Joe was right. Hurting myself by falling from the rack was an absolute possibility, but why wait until we were 17 miles away from town to tell me that? Why didn't he tell me that while we were still in Fresno?

"I told Joe that I would be careful. That I would not climb the ladder with a heavy load. That 25 or 30 lbs. of cotton would be all I would put in my sack at any time. But Joe just wouldn't let me work. So I told Joe that I was leaving, but that I was leaving under protest. That he had no business taking workers 17 miles out of town and then refuse to let them work.

"It took me 8½ hours to walk back to Fresno. In Fresno I talked to a lawyer about it and he said he was not interested in 'little things like that.' I wrote a letter to another lawyer about the same thing, and he didn't answer me.

"Now I don't care to collect anything for the time I lose...but I do want everybody to know how dirty and unscrupulous some of these so-called labor contractors are and what many of us poor suckers have to put up with working for them. A strong union of agricultural workers would be the solution to all or at least to most of our problems, but it seems as if a majority of us migrant workers are too stupid to realize that."

S.G. Vasquez
Fresno, California

"I recently had an opportunity to become aware of your magazine and I am sure I will find it most helpful for my work in the Migrant Ministry in the North Central states area for which I carry responsibility in behalf of the Division of Christian Life and Mission of the National Council of Churches."

Robert Kolze
Park Ridge, Illinois

"Several issues of FARM LABOR have come to our attention and we are interested in being placed on your regular mailing list. Your consideration of this will be appreciated."

Jack Donnachie, Acting Director
Office of Farm Labor Services
U.S. Department of Labor
Washington, D.C.

"I'm a senior in the college of agriculture at Davis. What's the chance of getting someone from you to speak at Davis. We would have asked you earlier, if we had known you existed. The first I heard of you was in the last issue of CALIFORNIA FARMER; with those people you're not too popular.

"The little discussion on the farm labor situation that's arisen at Davis has been dominated by the students and faculty of the College of Agriculture, many, perhaps most, of whom are either the close friends and associates of growers, the sons of growers, or growers themselves.

a Davis student.

REPORT TO THE SUBSCRIBER

Lest you forget, subscribers receive 12 issues worth of FARM LABOR for \$3.00, not 12 months' worth. But, with this issue, some subscriptions fall due for renewal, and many more annual memberships are due to be renewed. For the first time, the editors of FARM LABOR will be clearly evaluated by you, our readers. If most people renew their subscriptions and memberships, we will feel we have succeeded in spite of irregular issues, blank pages and broken staples. If not, we can only hope people have at least read the 12 issues they did receive.

We are glad that subscriptions are beginning to run out, not only because we will have the chance to see whether most people feel it is worth renewing, but also because we will have new money coming into a treasury which badly needs it. We will be waiting....

* * * * *

Members of Citizens for Farm Labor continue to play important roles in the process of educating communities and our society on the problems of farm workers. Some recent activities of members and advisors bear mention:

---Mrs. Katherine Peake recently made headlines by spending a day in the carrot fields of Indio; her purpose was to test the I.W.O. wage order which theoretically guarantees women a minimum of \$4 a day for field work. (She did not earn this much) See page 22.

---Staff member, Bill Esher, has left the Bay Area to assume the co-editorship of EL MALCRIADO, a farm worker newspaper. See page 10.

---Advisors Paul Jacobs and Violet Rotan testified for C.F.L. at the National Conference on Poverty in Tucson, Arizona on January 27th. Jacobs expressed the opinion that the war on poverty's chief enemy in the southwest is corporate agriculture--a very formidable enemy. His testimony was reprinted in many metropolitan newspapers. Mrs. Rotan's testimony described the working and living conditions of the California agricultural worker.

---C.F.L.'s Chairman, Henry Anderson has recently addressed the newly formed student committees for farm labor at Stanford and the University of California at Berkeley. He will lead a six week seminar on "Agriculture and the Social Order" at the Free University of California beginning March 12. He is currently in Mississippi, participating in a week-long rural organizing workshop sponsored by the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

---Michael Harrington, a new member of C.F.L.'s Advisory Board, will probably devote a large part of his keynote address to the Berkeley Conference on Poverty in America to a discussion of poverty in California's rich agricultural valleys.

---Herman Gallegos has recently been appointed to the directorship of the Hunter's Point Youth Opportunities Center.

---Father Ronald Burke of Gilroy was awarded the 1964 John F. Kennedy Human Rights Award in recognition of his work with the Gilroy Interfaith Migrant Committee and for his efforts to end the bracero program. The award was made by the Santa Clara County Catholic Interracial Council.

---Dr. Ernesto Galarza has been employed by the Los Angeles Youth Opportunities Board as a special consultant on problems in East Los Angeles. His first edition of MERCHANTS OF LABOR sold out within 6 weeks of publication.

* * * * *

PLEASE READ AND HEED THE ACTION BULLETIN IN THIS MONTH'S SPECIAL INSERT.

Index to FARM LABOR, Volume II, Numbers 1-6: July 1964-March 1965.

- Anderson, Henry. The Facts in the Case of McCarran and Walter. (II, 5)
 Courage Is Not Enough. (II, 1)
 The Insurance Principle and the Dead Hand. (II, 6)
- Citizens for Farm Labor. Testimony on the Supply of Domestic Farm Labor. (II, 5)
- Draper, Anne. The Fight for Protection of Women and Minors. (II, 3)
- DuBay, Father William. Youth and the Bracero Gap. (II, 2)
- El Malcriado. Speaking of Sugar Beets. (II, 6)
- Esher, William. Coyotes of the Cantaloupes. (II, 2)
 Waiting for Something to Happen. (II, 3)
- Friends Committee on Legislation. Candidates Take a Stand on Farm Labor. (II, 3)
- Goepel, Wendy. No Help Wanted. (II, 3)
- Grubbs, Donald. A Union That Really Was One. (II, 1)
- Gunterman, Joseph. Farm Placement Go Home. (II, 6)
- Jacobs, Paul. Man With A Hoe, 1964. (II, 2) (Reprinted from Commentary)
- Lipscomb, Manse. Scared to Speak a Man a Word. (II, 1)
- Mann, Bennett. Picking Bushberries in Manteca. (II, 2)
- Mitchell, H.L. To The Disinherited Belongs the Future. (II, 1)
- Munoz, Henry. The Problem of Border Crossers--commuters. (II, 6)
- Murdock, William. Skill Training and the Farm Worker. (II, 3)
- Olivas, Robert and Howard Richards, Katherine Peake. No More Immigration. (II, 2)
- Richards, Howard. Picking Carrots Near Indio. (II, 6)
- Thomas, Norman. The Plight of the Sharecropper. (II, 1)
- Wilson, Kirke. Reconciliation: A Community Development Approach. (II, 3)

* * * *

Note: Number 1: July 1964; Number 2: August 1964; Number 3: October 1964;
 Number 4: reprint of Vol. I, No. 1; Number 5: December 1964;
 Number 6: March 1965.

CITIZENS FOR FARM LABOR

Executive Committee:

Henry Anderson, Chairman
Wendy Goepel, Secretary

Anne Draper
Robert Mang
Max Awner

Robert Callagy
Dorothy Kauffman
Atty. Arthur Brunwasser

Advisory Board:

Rev. Booker T. Anderson
Andres Arellano
Bud Aronson
George Ballis
Hon. Willie Brown
Atty. Malcolm Burnstein
Hon. Phillip Burton
Rev. Richard Byfield
Cesar Chavez
Father Ralph Duggan
Edward P. Dutton
Prof. Lewis Feuer
Prof. Joseph Fontenrose
Herman Gallegos
Rev. Aron Gilmartin
Hon. Henry Gonzales
Evelio Grillo
Mr. and Mrs. Joe Sunterman
Michael Harrington

Rev. Wayne C. Hartwire
Atty. Gerald N. Hill
Paul Jacobs
Prof. Van Dusen Kennedy
Clive Knowles
Leonard Levy
Prof. Seymour Lipset
Dr. Jack Little
Prof. Jack London
Joan London
Father Thomas McCullough
Mr. and Mrs. Max Mont
Maria Moreno
Atty. James Murray
Robert Nolan, M.D.
Peter Odegard
William O'Rear
Walter Packard
Katherine Peake

Robert Pickus
Walter Press
Atty. Jose Rafael Ramos
Harry Rasmussen
Atty. Howard C. Richards
Milton Roemer, M.D.
Fred Ross
Violet Rotan
Gilbert Simonsen
Hon. Alfred Song
Nancy Swadesh
Norman Thomas
Prof. Joseph Tussman
Fred VanDyke
Rev. Dr. Harold Wilson
Prof. Marshall Windmiller
Thomas Winnett
Louis Zarate

Citizens for Farm Labor
P. O. Box 1173
Berkeley 1, California

____ I would like to become a member of Citizens for Farm Labor. Membership fees include a subscription to FARM LABOR. Rates: Individual, \$5; Couple, \$7.50; Organization, \$10.00

____ I would like a subscription to FARM LABOR magazine. Rate: \$3.00 for 12 issues.

____ I would like to make a financial contribution to the work of Citizens for Farm Labor.

NAME _____

TELEPHONE _____

ADDRESS _____

CITIZENS FOR FARM LABOR
BOX 1173, BERKELEY, CALIF.



RETURN POSTAGE GUARANTEED

Mrs. Elmer Daniels
4420 Ravenwood Avenue
Sacramento 21, California